



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

ign. How was it that the Scriptural passages never seemed to warrant the meanings which were, at last, so circuitously elaborated from them? Truth seemed to be put upon the rack, and stretched till her sinews were starting. Yet, though he saw all this, and saw it too with surprise and anguish of soul, he could not free himself from a difficulty which still beat him down. Often and often did he pause and exclaim in wonder—"How came this doctrine ever to be derived from these texts, which seem to have nothing to say to it?" That they were so derived, he had the assertion of his own Church—that they could not be so derived, he had the strongest evidence of his own reason. Thus hampered, he was not exasperated, until a hint from the rector gave him the solution which, at first staggered, and, at last, satisfied him. These doctrines were never derived from these texts at all. They grew up gradually. The Bible was not the ground of their reception. But having first gained growth and credit, recourse was afterwards had to the Scriptures, in order to give them some appearance of truth. Passages having any relevancy could not, of course, be found. Hence there was no alternative but to select some of the least refractory, and make up by assertion for what was wanting in proof. Such, said Mr. R., is the true explanation of the manifest want of bearing of the passages of Scripture adduced by the Church of Rome upon the doctrines which she seeks to establish by them.

In like manner, on the subject of authority, Father M. had already seen that the patristic quotations adduced in proof of it did not really reach the matter at all. But still his mind wanted deliverance from some doubts. Mr. R. had very much cleared his path, by showing him how it was imperatively necessary for the Church of Rome to assert universal tradition in her favour: that she made such allegation, not because it was a fact, but because, without such assertion, her claim must immediately fall. Since any thing short of such consent must let in the question of private judgment. Hence, Father M. perceived that there was another way of accounting for this claim of "universal consent," far different from that which he had been trained to believe—namely this, that his Church was forced, at all hazards, to make the assertion. This solution, of course, removed his chief difficulty—that of accounting for the irrelevancy and weakness of the extracts made from the early writers of the Christian Church. Thus gradually he found his objections disappearing, as his mind perceived the truth of Mr. R.'s assertion—"The necessities of the Roman Catholic Church have forced her to make statements which serve for her effectual refutation"—until he came, at last, to see his chief argument for an infallible authority so easily set aside that he wondered at his own blindness in not anticipating it. He now saw that if the dangers of private judgment be a good argument for an infallible authority, it told just as effectually, only in a different way, against his own, as against the Protestant Church. Since the former must use it as well as the latter, with, however, the additional absurdity of attempting to establish what she most prizes upon a principle which she incessantly condemns. Here again he saw the truth of another of Mr. R.'s statements—"Your Church always asserts Roman Catholic doctrine, but all she really proves is Protestant." She alleges her own dogmas, but she establishes ours; and the very highest testimony to the antiquity and Catholicity of the Church of England may be found in the controversial annals of the Church of Rome.

Tom Connell had listened with almost suspended breath until he perceived by Father M.'s face that his mind began to clear.

Silent, and still as stone for some time, through the excess of his anxiety, he began, as the discussion went on, to exhibit some signs of life, gazing, if possible, more earnestly into Father M.'s face, whenever a gleam of pleasure at the disappearance of some difficulty lightened it for a moment, and then, as these became more decided, rubbing his hands together with such energetic satisfaction as to threaten the dislocation of his wrists. Until at last, he saw Father M. to be clearly convinced that the Church of Rome did use without scruple, as it suited her purpose, that exercise of private judgment which she so condemned in the Protestant Churches. Tom could then contain himself no longer, but, in the intenseness of his satisfaction, thundered out with an energy which almost made both the gentlemen start from their seats, "The gooseberry boy! the gooseberry boy!—that's just it, your honour."

"What is the matter, Tom?" said Mr. R., smiling at our honest friend's indisputable recovery of his voice, and expecting from his well-known habit some amusing interlude.

"I beg both your reverences' pardon," said Tom, a little abashed; "but, indeed, I scarcely knew what I was saying."

"But what about 'the gooseberry boy,' Tom?" said Father M., looking on him with such kindly affection, as showed he knew why poor Tom had got so nearly beside himself.

"I'm sure I wish it had never come into my head at all," said Tom. "It was just what his reverence said about the Church of Rome doing herself what she won't let other

people do, which put it there; and, indeed, I'd rather hold my tongue now, as I ought to do."

"You have held it quite long enough, Tom," said Mr. R., who, seeing from Father M.'s great weakness that a little interval of rest would be desirable, gladly profited by Tom's interruption of their discussion to obtain it for a few moments—"Now, go on with the story."

"Well, then," replied Tom, "some of us, when I was a little boy, clubbed together for a treat of gooseberries, which we put into a cap, and, in order to share fairly, we settled to hold the cap between us, and each boy to take a gooseberry in his turn. We liked this well enough, and went on quite nicely until the gooseberries were getting low. However, there was a big greedy fellow among us, who always tried to get two for our one, and gobbled them down so quick, we had sometimes to tell him to eat fair. As the gooseberries were getting down, we began to eat a little faster, until, when we came near the end of them, this big fellow, who had already got a great deal more than his share, stops us all, and says, 'Now, boys, let none of us make a grab at the end; whoever does, I tell you what, we'll call him 'the gooseberry blackguard.' Do you all agree to that?' 'To be sure we do,' says we; for we never thought of playing such a dirty trick. But what do you think the *mane* fellow was at all the time? He just wanted to throw us off, in order to secure the grab for himself. So while we were never thinking a bit about it, he just digs both his hands into the bottom of the cap, and runs off with the last of our gooseberries. It made us mad at his pretending to think *we* were going to do a dirty thing, and intending to do it himself all the while. But the name of 'the gooseberry blackguard' stuck to him ever after. I don't know how it is that things come into my head when I don't want them there, and amn't thinking about them at all. But when your reverence was telling of all the fuss which the Church of Rome makes about any one using their good sense and reason about the Bible while she does the same herself, it came upon me, at once, like a flash of lightning, that she is mighty like the greedy boy who wanted to keep back all hands but his own, in order to make sure of the big grab for himself in the end."

Correspondence.

THE PRIMITIVE LITURGY.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE CATHOLIC LAYMAN.

SIR,—In reading and conversing on your papers concerning the Mass, Invocation of Saints, Adoration of Images and Reliques *cum multis aliis*, it has occurred to us to inquire whether any or many of these are to be found in the primitive Liturgies of the Church. With respect to these, we beg to propose you a query, which we humbly conceive to be an important one:—What was the form of public worship in the primitive Church?—the statement of which will oblige us greatly, and, we doubt not, be acceptable to many of your readers. As the Church of Rome boasts to be unchangeable, does it follow that the primitive Liturgy is the same as the modern Roman Ritual? Was the Mass celebrated? Were the saints invoked? Were images, candles, &c., used? In fact, we don't want so much to know what was *not* done, as what *was*. On the former of these points, the CATHOLIC LAYMAN is full of information; but, with respect to the latter, i.e., the actual *form* of divine worship, this is the point on which your humble servants are unable to determine anything, and which, perhaps, may open out a new chapter on discussion.

By the Primitive Church we understand the Church in (say) the first four centuries; which, we believe, is what is recognised as such by the CATHOLIC LAYMAN.

We remain, dear sir,

Your obedient servants,

ENQUIRER AND CO.

The question put to us by "Enquirer and Co." is deeply interesting; and we willingly endeavour to supply the information required.

The undertaking is not without difficulty. We have not room to print a collection of Liturgies in full. We must give a summary of portions, endeavouring, however, to show the form and substance; and giving at length the parts which are essential for what is asked of us. We will try not to omit anything important; and we will print any complaint made to us concerning our omissions, provided the complainants will quote in full the passages which they think we ought to have given. This pledge will probably obtain confidence for our selections.

But we have a greater difficulty than this. The services of all churches were altered from time to time, by little and little. Sometimes an additional prayer was adopted; sometimes an expression was altered or added; in fact, these services grew by degrees and slowly. Now, the ancient Liturgies, as we have them in print, were printed from manuscripts which were written at least 400 years or more after the end of the fourth century. Those Liturgies, therefore, as we have them, are very apt to contain things, and do contain things, which crept into them by degrees in ages later than the first four centuries. We must not suppose that everything in those Liturgies, as we now have them, was used in the primitive Church; but those Liturgies do contain what *was* used in the earliest ages. What is found in all ancient Liturgies, that we may be sure is

most ancient; what is found in but few is probably a later addition. We shall not omit anything because we think it modern, but shall give our reasons for so thinking.

The chief service in every church was that for the Holy Communion; besides this, there were other services of prayer merely. For the present, we shall confine ourselves to the services for the Holy Communion.

The following observations of the learned Roman Catholic Du Pin about ancient Liturgies is undoubtedly true:—"We need only to reflect on what we find recorded in the Epistle of St. Paul to the Corinthians (1 Ep. ch. xi), concerning the administration of the holy sacrament of the Eucharist, and upon the accounts of St. Justin, and other Primitive Fathers of the Church, to be persuaded that the Apostles and their successors celebrated the Eucharist with great simplicity. This hath been observed by all those that have written concerning Liturgies, who have unanimously agreed that the celebration of the Mass was performed in those primitive ages without much ceremony, and that they used but few prayers; but by little and little others were added, and several visible ceremonies were annexed, to render the service more venerable to the people. In fine, the churches afterwards regulated and committed to writing the manner of celebrating it, and this is what they called Liturgies, which, being compiled conformably to the various customs of divers places, are likewise found to be different. And forasmuch as men are naturally inclined to make some alterations in their exterior habit, many things from time to time have been successively added to them." (Du Pin, Eccl. Hist. vol. 1, p. 36. W. W. tr. ed. Dublin. 1723.)

We have not room for the authorities referred to for the simplicity of the apostolic celebration of the communion. We can only give the testimony of Pope Gregory the Great (about A.D. 600). When, among other things, he was accused of adding the Lord's Prayer to the communion service, he thus replied:—"We say the Lord's Prayer after the service because it was the custom of the Apostles to consecrate the Host by saying that prayer of oblation only (the Lord's Prayer). And it seemed to me very unsuitable that we should say over the oblation a prayer which a scholastic composed, and should not say over His body and blood that prayer which our Redeemer composed."* Pope Gregory the Great comprehended apostolic simplicity beyond his accusers, and beyond his age.

We think the most ancient Liturgy in existence is that contained in what are called the "Apostolical Constitutions" (Book 8, ch. 12).

Those Constitutions appear to have been drawn up in the 3rd century, and consist of a variety of rules, and laws, and directions.

It is difficult to tell sometimes what was actually the substance of these Constitutions when first drawn up; much was certainly put into them in later ages, and not a little, perhaps, by the forgers of the eighth century, of whom we have often had to speak. The Liturgy itself is introduced with a preface, "I, James, the brother of John, the son of Zebedee, say:" this certainly is not genuine.

The question of the date of these Constitutions is thus treated by the learned Roman Catholic doctor, Du Pin:—"Falsely imputed to St. Clement, and which, though written by a later author, yet contains many things very useful to the discipline of the Church. It is not known by whom or when they were composed. All that can be certainly affirmed is that they are cited by St. Epiphanius (about A.D. 350), and the author of the commentary on St. Matthew, falsely attributed to St. Chrysostom."

Du Pin considers it doubtful whether this can be the book quoted by Eusebius (Eccl. Hist., Book 3, chap. 25) and Athanasius.

His opinion is, "That it is most probable that the Constitutions ascribed to the Apostles or St. Clement belong to the third, or rather the fourth century, and that they have been from time to time corrected, altered, and augmented, according to the various customs of different ages and countries." (Du Pin, Eccl. Hist., vol. 1, p. 50, 51, W. W. tr. ed. Dublin, 1723.)

The learned Dr. Cave is of opinion that these Constitutions were drawn up about the same time as the canons called apostolical—that is, about the end of the second century. (Scriptor. Eccl. vol. 1, p. 29.)

But whether it were in the second, third, or fourth century, it is clear that the collector embodied in his work things then existing, many of which were even then, perhaps, ancient.

There seems no reason to doubt that the Liturgy inserted in those Constitutions was one then in common, and, perhaps, ancient use; and that it represents the source from whence most other liturgies are derived.

To assist "Enquirer and Co.," we print a translation of the greater part of this Liturgy in another column. We feel persuaded that Roman Catholics and Protestants will read it with equal interest. Roman Catholics will try to find in it not only invocation of the Virgin and the saints, and the use of images, candles, &c., but still more, the essentials of the sacrifice of the Mass—viz., that

* Oratorem vero dominicam idcirco maximo precem dicimus; quia mos apostolorum fuit, ut ad ipsam solam post orationem oblationis hostiam consecrarent. Et valde mihi inconveniens visum est, ut precem quam scholasticus composuerat super oblationem dicereimus et ipsam traditionem quam Redemptor noster composuit super ejus corpus et sanguinem taceremus." Epistles, Book vii. part ii. ep. 64. Labbe and Coss. Con. Gen., vol. V., col 1318. Ed. Par. 1672.

the bread ceases to be bread at the words of consecration; and is changed into the Body and Blood of Christ; and that the sacrifice offered on an earthly altar is the Lord Jesus Christ Himself, Body, Blood, Soul, and Divinity. Members of the Church of England and Ireland will trace with surprise and pleasure how much of their own Prayer-book; Morning and Evening Prayers; the Litany; the Collects; and the Communion Service; has come down to them from the very earliest times to which we can trace the worship of the Church. The admirable beauties of the Book of Common Prayer are our inheritance from the Primitive Church, and not from the modern Church of Rome.

We hope to trace in other numbers the subsequent progress and corruption of liturgies.

IS THE ROMAN CATHOLIC CHURCH RESPONSIBLE FOR FATHER FURNISS'S BOOK?

TO THE EDITOR OF THE CATHOLIC LAYMAN.

SIR,—You profess, and, I must admit, usually practise so much candour and fair play towards your opponents, that I was rather surprised to see you attempt in your last number to fasten upon the (Roman) Catholic Church at large the principles extracted from Father Furniss's book, merely because it was printed under the sanction of Archbishop Cullen.

I think you must be well aware that there are many (Roman) Catholics who would repudiate and reprobate such lax morality, just as strongly as yourself; and what would you think of any (Roman) Catholic writer attempting to render the Church of England or Ireland responsible for the private opinions, or even published sentiments, of any particular Bishop?

I ask you boldly, whether you, as an advocate for the Church of England, consider yourself responsible for everything printed or preached by, for example, the present Bishop of Exeter, on the one hand, or the Protestant Archbishop of Dublin, on the other?

Unless you are ready to admit that you are so responsible, or can assign some substantial reason for denying such responsibility, I must take leave to deny the fairness and impartiality of your charge of lax morality upon the (Roman) Catholic Church at large, merely because Archbishop Cullen has thought proper to affix his imprimatur upon the brochure in question.

A LOVER OF FAIR PLAY.

We cordially agree with the writer of this letter that many Roman Catholics repudiate and reprobate the lax morality of Father Furniss just as strongly as ourselves. We rejoice to think that it is so. To such Roman Catholics we appeal, and we ask them to compare the system of a Church which does not make itself responsible for such morality, and of a Church which, we are about to show, does make itself responsible for it.

The Church of England and Ireland does not profess to be infallible, but encourages all persons to search the Scriptures, and try by them the teaching of her Ministers, she herself being responsible only for her articles of faith, and other formularies published in the Book of Common Prayer.

The Church of Rome does profess to be infallible in both faith and morals, and denying the right of private judgment, commands all persons to submit to the Church.

The Church of England and Ireland does not undertake to prohibit or sanction books with her authority. The Church of Rome does undertake to do so, and, claiming to be "infallible in faith and morals," is responsible for what is so put forth.

A bishop of the Church of England, in writing or recommending a book, is merely acting as an individual, and however high his station or personal character, his Church is not responsible for what he does. But a bishop of the Church of Rome, in sanctioning a book, is exercising a function and authority committed to him for that purpose by his Church, and for which his Church is, therefore, responsible.

For this we refer to the Bull of Pope Leo X., confirmed in the 5th Lateran (General) Council, A.D. 1515,* and to the 10th of the rules concerning prohibited books, drawn up by the committee of the Council of Trent, and confirmed by Pope Pius IV., and which are still in full force. They are printed at the end of the Records of that Council, and dated 24th March, 1564.

We request our correspondent to read our article on the Index Prohibitorius and the Index Expurgatorius in the CATHOLIC LAYMAN of October, 1853, Vol. II., No. 22, p. 110, by which he will see that express power is given to Bishops to condemn and prohibit even the books permitted by the rules of the Index themselves.

Every Bishop in the Church of Rome is, in fact, entrusted by that Church with an unlimited power of attorney within his diocese or province to condemn and prohibit all books which, according to the views of the Church of Rome, are prejudicial to either faith or morals;† and so

far is this power from being obsolete, that it is every day acted upon.

Witness the "Scripture extracts of the National Board," "the Lessons on the Evidences of Christianity," and many other books, which have been prohibited in Ireland within the last few years, by the authority of the Church of Rome, to say nothing of the CATHOLIC LAYMAN, which the Most Rev. Dr. Cullen has so especially denounced in one of his recent Pastorals.

That Father Furniss's book, the lax morality of which has shocked our correspondent and so many other Roman Catholics, has not only not been forbidden by the Church of Rome, but has been published and republished under the special sanction and "Imprimatur" of Dr. Cullen, the authorized officer of the Church of Rome in this province to prohibit or sanction books, according to their merits in "faith and morals," seems conclusive upon the point that his Church, at large, is responsible for this most alarming publication. In fact, the Church of Rome would have been responsible for everything contained in such a work, even though not published under the express sanction of Dr. Cullen, unless it were publicly censured and prohibited; which it is in his power as well as his official duty to do, unless he is prepared to say openly that he approves of it.

The book is obviously designed for the people at large; it has been disseminated in thousands of copies at the lowest possible price, by the Redemptorist Fathers, who are the authorized missionaries of the Church of Rome, sent specially to counteract the efforts of Protestant missionaries among the people of Ireland. It is either good or bad. If there be any doubt as to the genuineness of the "Imprimatur," we call on Dr. Cullen publicly to disclaim it, and pronounce his disapprobation of the publication; and we warn him that the matter is not unlikely to be brought before Parliament in the present session, where a neutral policy will scarcely be satisfactory to the English public.

THE RULE OF FAITH.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE CATHOLIC LAYMAN.

MR. EDITOR,—After dark, yesterday evening, Jerry called for me, and, says he, "I'm going to the discussion, and come along." "Who's to discuss?" says I. "Andy Kelly, the priest's schoolmaster, and one of the Readers," says he. "Well," says I, "I'd like to go; but don't you remember how Father John warned us last Sunday against going to discussions?" "I remember it well," says he; "but I found something in Doctor Milner that proves plainly that we ought to listen to discussions, and hear both sides of the question." "If Doctor Milner is for it," says I, "I've no more to say." "Well," says Jerry, "here's what he says: 'Many adhere to their religious system, merely because they were educated in it, and because it was that of their parents and family, which, if it were a reasonable motive for their resolution, would equally excuse Jews, Turks, and Pagans in adhering to their respective impieties, and would impeach the preaching of Christ and his Apostles.' Now, Dan," says he, "isn't that a slap in the face to ourselves? Tell me," says he, "why are we Catholics at all?" "Because our fathers and mothers were Catholics before us," says I. "True for you," says he; "that's the only reason we have for our religion, and sure the Turks and Pagans have that same; but I'm determined," says he, "to try and get some better reason for my religion than that. I'd like to be able to prove to Protestants that we're right, and to give some reason for being a Catholic. So, with the help of God, I'll attend every discussion that I can come across." "Well," says I, "the never a one of me will fail you, so come along." Well, sir, we got to the house just as the discussion began, and the Reader stood up, and says he, "Boys, the subject for to-night is THE RULE OF FAITH." "What do you mean," says one of the boys, "by a rule of faith?" "I mean," says the Reader, "the standard to which we are to refer in our differences about religion; for instance," says he, "we differ about Purgatory, and about the mass, and about transubstantiation, and about many other doctrines; but we might talk till we grew black in the face without proving who was right or who was wrong. We must refer," says he, "to something else beside our own words; and that standard we call the rule of faith." "I see how it is," says Jerry. "It's like two of the boys that were disputing about the length of the master's new ladder. 'Its forty feet,' says one; 'No, it's thirty feet,' says the other, and they kept on arguing about it until Tom Nolan, the carpenter, says to them, 'You pair of fools,' says he, 'you might dispute till to-morrow morning without settling it; but take the RULE,' says he, 'and measure it, and then, maybe, you'll come to an agreement.' "That's the very way," says the Reader. "I may say that the doctrine of Purgatory is false, and you may say that it's true; but neither my word nor your word will settle the matter. We must refer to some rule or other." "Well," says Andy, "what you say is true enough; and we admit that Christ left a rule for our guidance, and you admit the same." "Yes," says the Reader, "both Protestants and Roman Catholics agree that there is a rule; but we differ about what that rule is. We say that it's the Bible alone, while you say that

it's the Bible and tradition." "Well," says Andy, "state the Protestant rule first, and I'll do my best to prove that 'tisn't the right one, and then I'll state our rule, and you may pick a hole in it if you're able." So the boys said that 'twas fair, and the two disputers set to work. "Now, boys," says the Reader, "look at this book that I hold in my hand—that's the Bible, the written word of God, and my rule of faith." "Stop," says Andy, "that's not the whole of your rule. Your rule is the Bible, and the private judgment of the person who hears or reads it." "No," says the Reader, "that's not my rule of faith." "Why," says Andy, "Doctor Milner says that it is," and Keenan says the same. "I don't care what they say," says the Reader; "let them prove it. I won't put any doctrines on you but what I prove out of your own books; and," says he, "show me in any of my articles or creeds where private judgment is made a part of my rule of faith." "That's only fair," says Jerry; "and though he's a Protestant he should get fair play." Well, sir, one of the boys reached Andy a Protestant prayer-book, and he looked out for proof of what Doctor Milner had said; but the more he looked the more he couldn't find it. So at last he took up Milner and Keenan to see what proofs they gave of it; but the never a proof did they give but their own word. At last Andy turns round to the Reader, and, says he, "Have you the face to tell me that your Church doesn't hold private judgment?" "No," says the Reader, "I don't say any such thing. We do hold private judgment, but not as any part of our rule, but as that which applies the rule. I must try," says he, "to make this plain to you. Tell me," says he, "when Tom Nolan was measuring the ladder with his rule was his hand any part of the rule?" "No," says Jerry, "'twas the means by which he made use of the rule, but 'twas no part of the rule itself." "That's just the thing," says the Reader. "Now, the Bible is our rule, and private judgment is our way of using the rule." "Before I've done with you," says Andy, "I'll show you that it's a very bad way of using it, and that it leads you into all sorts of error; and I'll prove that your rule is useless, because it's so obscure and difficult; and I'll show you that there are some things necessary for salvation that aren't contained in it at all." "Well," says the Reader, "let us keep to one thing at a time. I'll try now to prove that my rule contains all that is necessary for salvation, and then, if you're able, you may show that it doesn't. In the first place," says he, "St. Paul says that the holy Scriptures were able to instruct Timothy unto salvation." Now, how can the Scriptures instruct a man unto salvation unless they contain all that is necessary for salvation? "Stop a while," says Andy. "I have you now. St. Paul refers there to the Old Testament; for the New Testament wasn't written then." "I know it well," says the Reader; "but instead of that being against me, it's for me; for," says he, "if the Old Testament was able to instruct a man unto salvation, how much more can both Old and New do it?" "Well," says Andy, "we'll pass that by for a while; but I'll now show you plainly that there are some things necessary to salvation which are not contained in the Bible. For instance, the change of the Sabbath. You know," says he, "that in ancient times God's people kept the Sabbath on the seventh day of the week, but Protestants now keep it on the first." "But," says the Reader, "there's no difference between us on that point; you keep it on the same day that we do." "That won't do for you," says Andy; "you shan't get out of the difficulty that way. You must tell me by what authority you keep it on the first day of the week, instead of on the seventh." "By the authority of Scripture," says the Reader. "The inspired Apostles made the change, and we have it in our Bibles." "No," says Andy; "there's no Scripture for it. Your rule of faith is deficient there, and you're obliged to have recourse to tradition, after all. Just listen to what Dr. Milner says. He first asks what authority Protestants have for the change of the Sabbath, and then he says, 'None whatever, except the unwritten word, or tradition of the Catholic Church;' and Keenan says the same." "Well," says the Reader, "it's wonderful how your Bishops go one against the other. Here's Dr. Doyle's Catechism, and he tells us in it^b that the day was changed by the Apostles. And what proof do you think he gives?" "Tradition, of course," says Andy. "No, but SCRIPTURE," says the Reader. He refers us to the book of the Apocalypse, chap. i. 10. And, moreover," says the Reader, "here's your own Catechism of the Council of Trent, and it tells us that we may learn this point from the Bible. It says, 'We also learn FROM THE SACRED VOLUME that the first day of the week was held sacred.' And, again," says the Reader, "there's a note to a verse in your own Douay Bible,^c which says that St. Chrysostom and other interpreters learn from that verse (not from tradition, mind) that the Sabbath was changed. And, again," says he, "there's a note in your large Douay Bible that's clearer

* Labbe and Coss. Con. Gen. Vol. xiv. 257. Ed. Paris. 1672.

† We do not see, indeed, how it could be otherwise in a Church which denies the right of private judgment, and claims to be an infallible guide to every man. It is obvious that every member of the Church cannot consult the Pope upon each point. The only accessible representative of the Church to Roman Catholics (except one in a million), must be the priest or bishop under whom they are placed, and who alone, according to the principles of the Church of Rome, have power to guide their flocks in either faith or morals.

^b End of Controversy, Letter V.
^c Controversial Catechism, by Rev. Stephen Keenan. Third Edition. Chap. v., Sec. 3.

^d 2 Timothy iii. 15.
^e John xx. 19; Acts xx. 7; 1 Cor. xvi. 2; Apoc. i. 10.

^f John xx. 19; Acts xx. 7; 1 Cor. xvi. 2; Apoc. i. 10.

^g Abridgment of Christian Doctrine, page 52.
^h Part iii., chap. iv., question xviii.

ⁱ Acts xx. 7.

* End of Controversy, Letter V.